



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,036	03/24/2004	Dan Scott Johnson	100201135-1	5669
22879 7590 12/12/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER GRAHAM, PAUL J				
ART UNIT 2426		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 12/12/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/808,036

**Applicant(s)**

JOHNSON, DAN SCOTT

**Examiner**

PAUL GRAHAM

**Art Unit**

2426

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-15, 17, 18, 20-22 and 25-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-15, 17-18, 20-22, 25-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/8/08 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant argues:

*The prior art does not suggest A/V menu display on a first presentation device and A/V program data selected and displayed on second presentation device.*

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In fact, the prior art references read on the claimed limitation, for example, at least, in the following illustrations: There is a presentation device that shows the menu of A/V data for the user and also a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Williams, fig. 2, col. 4, ll. 13-65).

There is a presentation device that shows the menu of A/V data for the user and also a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Salmonsens, fig. 12, 13 and [167-171]).

There is a presentation device that shows a menu of A/V data for the user and a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Accarie, fig. 10, 11, [406-408], at local node and terminal chosen).

The Applicant's argument has been fully considered, but is not persuasive. The claims 1, 3-15, 17-18, 20-22, 25-28 stand rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 13, 22, 27 and their dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Fig. 1 of the instant application only shows one presentation device coupled to a sink component, in each instance, therefore there is absolutely no support for the existence of a second presentation device that is coupled to a sink component (as defined in claim 10, further limiting the invention of claim 1) and displays A/V program data.

Assuming en arguendo that fig. 2 portrays what is attempting to be claimed, there is NO distinction between the 1st and 2nd presentation device coupled to the sink component for 2 reasons, one) based on the instant specification said presentation devices may be within the same I/O component [25-26], second) according to the figure enumeration (i.e., the presentation device = element 14) there is no distinguishing between presentation devices, which includes the type of presentation device, therefore, there is NO support for basing "data available on the type of the second presentation device".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 11-13, 17, 22, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams, Jr. (US 6202211 B1) and Accarie et al. (US 2003/0048757 A1) in view of Salmonsens (US 2004/0049797 A1).

As to claim 1, Williams discloses an audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising (see Williams, fig. 4):

A plurality of source components each including A/V program data (see Williams, fig. 3, col. 5, ll. 34-39, receiving from a source component from remote

systems within another network, see col. 6, ll. 7-11, and the cable system (fig. 5) into a number of tuners (see col. 1, ll. 60-64) fig. 4 and 5 shows a stereo, television, cable box as plurality of sources);

a first presentation device and a second presentation device (see Williams, fig. 4 and 5, TVs and stereo, col. 5, l. 55-col. 6, l. 65);

and a sink component disposed remote from at least one of the plurality of source components, the sink component adapted to display on the first presentation device a menu presenting the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components, the sink component adapted to control presentation of desired A/V program data selected from the menu of A/V program data and received from the corresponding source component on the second presentation device (see Williams, fig. 4, STB is a sink distinct from source in the server, adapted to control, see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-49),

the sink component adapted to transmit a command to the source component to control displaying of an A/V interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, if cable box is set correctly (controlled by STB) cable converter box output streams to TV via STB control, In fact, the cited reference reads on the claimed limitation, as the channel (an interface providing A/V data) from the cable converter box may be selected by user (see Williams Jr., coll. 6, ll. 43-54)

In fact, "selecting the appropriate mode" (see Williams Jr., col. 6, ll. 43-54) shows enablement to control a menu interface. The channel setting (an inherent

menu manipulation) is controlled by the STB, which shows enablement of a user to control a menu interface. In fact, Accarie also shows enablement of the user to control a menu interface, Williams Jr. shows the sink remote from the storage system, Accarie notes a sink remote from storage (see Accarie, [442], terminal v. local node v. VTR, represents separate units). And, Salmonsens shows a sink separate from storage, (see Salmonsens, fig. 3, separate functional units) (see Salmonsens, [0105], a media renderer (sink) controls the streaming of VOB files from the source to the display (presentation device, see control signals (fig. 3) from media source to renderer to video display to show control menus for subtitles and languages));

Williams teaches control of data, but is unclear on control of menu interface from the source component; Accarie, who discloses a network communication system does teach control of menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447])).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams with the system of Accarie to allow the user to access the menu of control functions of a remote source component (see Accarie, [0453]).

The references of Williams and Accarie control of a menu interface, but are unclear on use of menu on one presentation device, and receiving from corresponding source on second presentation device.

However, Salmonsens, who discloses network interfacing, does show a sink component receiving menu data for display (see Salmonsens, fig. 3, 4) and another presentation device receiving program data from a corresponding source (see Salmonsens, fig. 14, multiple sources may go to multiple renderers, fig. 5, 6, the prior art references read on the claimed limitation, for example, at least, in the following illustrations: There is a presentation device that shows the menu of A/V data for the user and also a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Williams, fig. 2, col. 4, ll. 13-65).

There is a presentation device that shows the menu of A/V data for the user and also a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Salmonsens, fig. 12, 13 and [167-171]).

There is a presentation device that shows a menu of A/V data for the user and a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Accarie, fig. 10, 11, [406-408], at local node and terminal chosen)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams and Accarie with the system of Salmonsens so that the user could make selections from a dynamic menu display presented by the sink unit (see Salmonsens, [0054]).



As to claim 13, Williams discloses an audio/video (A/V) component networking method, comprising (see Williams, fig. 4 and col. 3, ll. 20-60):

controlling, via a sink component, presentation of desired A/V program data selected from the menu and received from a remote source component on a presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-50, STB provides the tuned TV signal to TV in selected mode, it is inherent that *desired* data would be *selected*, and subsequently received);

and controlling, via a command issued by the sink component to the source component, displaying of an A/V interface of the source component for presentation on the presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box outputs stream to TV via STB control).

Williams teaches control of data, but is unclear on control of menu interface from the source component; Accarie, who discloses a network communication system does teach control of menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams with the

system of Accarie to allow the user to access the menu of control functions of a remote source component (see Accarie, [0453]).

The references of Williams and Accarie control of a menu interface, but are unclear on use of menu on one presentation device, and receiving from corresponding source on second presentation device.

However, Salmonsens, who discloses network interfacing, does show a sink component receiving menu data for display (see Salmonsens, fig. 3, 4) and another presentation device receiving program data from a corresponding source (see Salmonsens, fig. 14, multiple sources may go to multiple renderers, fig. 5, 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams and Accarie with the system of Salmonsens so that the user could make selections from a dynamic menu display presented by the sink unit (see Salmonsens, [0054]).

As to claim 27, Williams disclose an audio/video (A/V) component networking method, comprising (see Williams, fig. 4 and col. 3, ll. 20-60):

receiving, via the sink component, the desired A/V program data from a corresponding source component, and (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-50, STB receives the tuned TV signal to TV in selected mode and transmits it on);

presenting the desired A/V program data on a second presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from

remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box outputs stream to TV (separate from STB) via STB control); and

Williams teaches control of data, but is unclear on control of menu interface from the source component; Accarie, who discloses a network communication system does teach control of menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams with the system of Accarie to allow the user to access the menu of control functions of a remote source component (see Accarie, [0453]);

providing, via the sink component, a real time, automatically updating, menu interface of the source component on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0445], as soon as terminal is selected (real-time), the list (the menu interface) of learned commands are displayed, the learned commands are updates and this is done automatically with terminal selection).

The references of Williams and Accarie control of a menu interface, but are unclear on use of menu on one presentation device, and receiving from corresponding source on second presentation device.

However, Salmonsens, who discloses network interfacing, does show a sink component receiving menu data for display (see Salmonsens, fig. 3, 4) and

another presentation device receiving program data from a corresponding source (see Salmonsens, fig. 14, multiple sources may go to multiple renderers, fig. 5, 6), (see Salmonsens, [0105], a media renderer (sink) controls the streaming of VOB files from the source to the display (presentation device, see control signals (fig. 3) from media source to renderer to video display to show control menus for subtitles and languages);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams and Accarie with the system of Salmonsens so that the user could make selections from a dynamic menu display presented by the sink unit (see Salmonsens, [0054]).

As to claim 28, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens (as combined) disclose the method of claim 27, further comprising:

Receiving an input by the sink component corresponding to a menu interface presented on the first presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit—input to STB (sink and presentation device)) and

Transferring the input to the source component corresponding to the desired A/V program data (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable converter box (source) outputs stream to TV based on channel selection from STB control, it is inherent that *desired* data would be input to *corresponding* source component).

As to claim 22, Williams discloses an audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising (see Williams, fig. 4, and col. 3, ll. 20-60):

Means for controlling, via a sink component, presentation of desired A/V program data selected from the menu and received from the corresponding source component on a second presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit, controlled by STB (a presentation device) cable converter box output streams to TV (another presentation device) via STB control); and

Means for controlling, via a command issued by the sink component to the source component, streaming of an A/V interface from the source component for presentation on the presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box output streams to TV via STB control).

Williams teaches control of data, but does not explicitly teach control of menu interface from the source component; Accarie, who discloses a network communication system does teach control of menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams with the

system of Accarie to allow the user to access the menu of control functions of a remote source component (see Accarie, [0453]).

The references of Williams and Accarie control of a menu interface, but are unclear on use of menu on one presentation device, and receiving from corresponding source on second presentation device.

However, Salmonsens, who discloses network interfacing, does show a sink component receiving menu data for display (see Salmonsens, fig. 3, 4, and therefore a means for displaying) and another presentation device receiving program data from a corresponding source (see Salmonsens, fig. 14, multiple sources may go to multiple renderers, fig. 5, 6) (see Salmonsens, [0105], a media renderer (sink) controls the streaming of VOB files from the source to the display (presentation device, see control signals (fig. 3) from media source to renderer to video display to show control menus for subtitles and languages);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams and Accarie with the system of Salmonsens so that the user could make selections from a dynamic menu display presented by the sink unit (see Salmonsens, [0054]).

As to claim 3, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens (as combined ) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to enable the user to access the A/V menu interface associated with the source component corresponding to the desired A/V program data (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a

screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447] is access to the A/V menu interface (see Accarie, [0398]), it is inherent that user would be given access to component of desired data).

As to claim 5, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens and Hunter (as combined in claim 1) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to transfer the A/V program data via a plurality of different types of communication networks (see Accarie, [0249-252], switching between A/V networks of different types (1355/1394) transferring data, the storage means is capable of handling different packet types [0257]).

As to claim 7, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens (as combined) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the plurality of the source components includes a satellite receiver source component, a digital versatile disk (DVD) source component, a compact disc (CD) source component, a computer, and a cable source component (see Williams, fig. 5 and col. 5, ll. 35-45, cable source component).

As to claim 11, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens (as combined ) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to control a menu function associated with the A/V program data (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command, a menu function associated with the A/V program data from cable box (a source) (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box output streams to TV via STB control).

As to claim 12, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens (as combined) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to access an A/V program data library of the source component corresponding to the desired A/V program data (see Accarie, [0371], a local node (sink) receives program data (from source) and stores in RAM, if follows that access would be to the *desired* data).

As to claim 17, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens and Hunter (as combined in claim 13) disclose the system of claim 13, wherein controlling, via a command issued by the sink component, comprises transmitting the command to at least one of the group consisting of a satellite receiver component, a digital versatile disk (DVD) component, a cable component, a computer, and a compact disk (CD) component (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box outputs stream to TV via STB control).

7. Claims 4, 6, 8, 14-15, 18, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams, Jr. (US 6202211 B1) and Accarie et al. (US 2003/0048757 A1) in view of Salmonsens (US 2004/0049797 A1) in view of Hunter et al. (US 2002/0056118 A1) .

As to claim 4, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens and Hunter (as combined in claim 1) disclose the method of claim 1,



The references of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsens are unclear on further comprising performing a registration operation to register the source component corresponding to the desired A/V program data with the sink component; however, Hunter does teach this (see Hunter, [0163-0165], the sink registers the CD or another type of media player for playback, it is inherent that user would be given access to component of desired data).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsens with the system of Hunter in order to recognize multiple sources of programming data allowing the end user variety in his entertainment choice (see Hunter, [0164]).

As to claim 6, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens and Hunter (as combined) disclose the system of claim 1,

The references of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsens are unclear on wherein the sink component is adapted to perform a registration operation to register a format of the A/V program data available from the plurality of source components; however, Hunter does teach this (see Hunter, [0163-0165], the sink registers the format of a CD or another type of storage media for playback).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsens with the system of Hunter in order for program format to be variable

from the content sources, making for a more robust entertainment system (see Hunter, [0164]).

As to claim 8, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsén and Hunter (as combined) disclose the system,

The references of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsén are unclear on wherein the sink component is adapted to perform a registration operation to register the presentation device with the sink component; however, Hunter does teach this (see Hunter, [0142] through communication with the on-screen GUI (of the presentation device) the user station, sink, realizes information about the user preferences for display on the presentation device, hence registers the device).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsén with the system of Hunter in order to allow the system to correctly recognize the device data is sent to for display therefore no delay in user interaction with the data occurs (see Hunter, [0142]).

As to claims 14 and 25, they are analyzed similar to claim 4.

As to claim 18, it is analyzed similar to claim 3.

As to claim 15, it is analyzed similar to claim 6.

8. Claims 9, 10, 20, 21, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams, Jr. (US 6202211 B1) in view of Accarie et al. (US 2003/0048757 A1) in view of Salmonsén (US 2004/0049797 A1) in view of

Hunter et al. (US 2002/0056118 A1) in view of Williams et al. (US 2004/0019908 A1—hereafter known as Chris Williams).

As to claim 9, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsén (as combined) disclose the system of claim 1,

The references of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsén are unclear on wherein the sink component is adapted to present to the user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a format of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components; however Chris Williams does teach this (see Chris Williams, fig. 5, each source has a different data format, the prior art references read on the claimed limitation, for example, at least, in the following illustrations: There is a presentation device that shows the menu of A/V data for the user and also a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Williams, fig. 2, col. 4, ll. 13-65).

There is a presentation device that shows the menu of A/V data for the user and also a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Salmonsén, fig. 12, 13 and [167-171]).

There is a presentation device that shows a menu of A/V data for the user and a presentation device that displays the A/V data selected for the user to experience (see Accarie, fig. 10, 11, [406-408], at local node and terminal chosen)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie, Hunter and Salmonsens with the system of Chris Williams in order to allow the end user the pleasure of entertainment from several various sources (see Chris Williams, [0026]).

As to claim 10, Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens (as combined ) disclose the system of claim 1,

The references of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsens are unclear on wherein the sink component is adapted to present to the user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device; however Chris Williams does teach this (see Chris Williams, fig. 5, the audio data will be reproduced on an audio presenter, speaker system of fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie, Hunter and Salmonsens with the system of Chris Williams in order to allow the end user the pleasure of entertainment from several various sources (see Chris Williams, [0026]).

As to claim 20, it is analyzed similar to claim 9.

As to claims 21 and 26, they are analyzed similar to claim 10.

***Conclusion***

9. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Inquiries***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul J. Graham whose telephone number is 571-270-1705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00a-5:00p EST.
- If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on 571-272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

pjg  
11/30/08

/Annan Q Shang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2424